



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,207	03/26/2004	Cheisan J. Yue	P04,0097 (H0005049,SBE 16	1964
128	7590	04/20/2006		EXAMINER
HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC. 101 COLUMBIA ROAD P O BOX 2245 MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245			LEWIS, MONICA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2822

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/811,207	YUE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Monica Lewis	2822	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 20-39 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                     | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed February 13, 2006.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 13, 14 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Librizzi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,429,502) in view of Hirabayashi (U.S. Patent No. 5,889,314).

In regards to claim 1, Librizzi et al. (“Librizzi”) discloses the following:

- a) a semiconductor substrate (40) (For Example: See Figure 2);
- b) a buried insulation layer (42) over the semiconductor substrate (For Example: See Figure 2);
- c) a semiconductor mesa (28 or 34) over the buried insulation layer (For Example: See Figure 1 and Figure 2); and
- d) a guard ring (36 and 38) substantially surrounding the semiconductor mesa, and wherein the guard ring is arranged to provide RF isolation for the semiconductor mesa (For Example: See Figure 1 and Column 5 Lines 55-57).

In regards to claim 1, Librizzi fails to disclose the following:

- a) the guard ring is in contact with the semiconductor substrate.

However, Hirabayashi discloses a semiconductor device that has a guard ring that is in contact with the semiconductor substrate (20) (For Example: See Column 4 Lines 60-67 and Column 5 Lines 1 and 2). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

Art Unit: 2822

the time the invention was made to modify the semiconductor of Librizzi to include a guard ring that is in contact with the semiconductor substrate as disclosed in Hirabayashi because it aids in preventing cross-talk noise (For Example: See Column 2 Lines 45-50).

Additionally, since Librizzi and Hirabayashi are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose disclosed by Hirabayashi would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Librizzi.

In regards to claims 2, 6, 10 and 14, Librizzi discloses the following:

a) the semiconductor substrate comprises a high resistivity semiconductor substrate (For Example: See Column 5 Lines 19-22).

In regards to claims 5 and 13, Librizzi discloses the following:

a) the semiconductor substrate is doped in an area that is contacted by the guard ring (For Example: See Column 5 Lines 15 and 16).

In regards to claim 9, Librizzi discloses the following:

a) an insulating ring (26) between the guard ring and the semiconductor mesa, wherein the insulating ring surrounds the semiconductor mesa (For Example: See Figure 1).

In regards to claim 17, Librizzi discloses the following:

a) the guard ring comprises a low resistivity guard ring (For Example: See Column 6 Line 6).

In regards to claim 18, Librizzi fails to disclose the following:

a) the guard ring comprises a metal guard ring.

However, Hirabayashi discloses a semiconductor device that has a metal guard ring (For Example: See Column 5 Lines 1-14). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the semiconductor of Librizzi to include a metal guard ring as disclosed in Hirabayashi because it aids in providing a low resistance (For Example: See Column 5 Lines 1-14).

Additionally, since Librizzi and Hirabayashi are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose disclosed by Hirabayashi would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Librizzi.

In regards to claim 19, Librizzi fails to disclose the following:

- a) the guard ring comprises a tungsten guard ring.

However, Hirabayashi discloses a semiconductor device that has a tungsten guard ring (For Example: See Column 5 Lines 1-14). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the semiconductor of Librizzi to include a tungsten guard ring as disclosed in Hirabayashi because it aids in providing a low resistance (For Example: See Column 5 Lines 1-14).

Additionally, since Librizzi and Hirabayashi are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose disclosed by Hirabayashi would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Librizzi.

4. Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Librizzi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,429,502) in view of Hirabayashi (U.S. Patent No. 5,889,314) and Beyer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,264,387).

In regards to claims 3, 7, 11 and 15, Librizzi discloses the following:

- a) the semiconductor substrate comprises a silicon substrate, wherein the buried insulating layer comprises a buried silicon oxide layer (For Example: See Column 5 Lines 14-18).

In regards to claims 3, 7, 11 and 15, Librizzi fails to disclose the following:

- a) the semiconductor mesa comprises a silicon mesa.

However, Beyer et al. ("Beyer") discloses a semiconductor device that has semiconductor mesa that comprises a silicon mesa (For Example: See Column 3 Lines 15 and 16). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

modify the semiconductor of Librizzi to include semiconductor mesa that comprises a silicon mesa as disclosed in Beyer because it aids in providing low leakage (For Example: See Column 2 Lines 20-24).

Additionally, since Librizzi and Beyer are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose disclosed by Beyer would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Librizzi.

In regards to claims 4, 8, 12 and 16, Librizzi discloses the following:

a) the semiconductor substrate comprises a high resistivity semiconductor substrate (For Example: See Column 5 Lines 19-22).

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed 2/13/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that "the Examiner has not shown that extending the guard rings 36 and 38 disclosed in the Librizzi patent to the silicon substrate 40 would aid in preventing cross talk. Indeed, the combination of the Librizzi patent and the Hirabayashi patent suggest no such thing...The problem as postulated by the Librizzi patent and the Hirabayashi patent is to prevent noise from migrating through the substrate from one electronic device to another. The solution offered by the Hirabayashi patent is to ground the substrate...the solution offered by the Librizzi patent is to replace the low resistivity substrate and to add an insulator over the low resistivity substrate for good measure...taken together, these patents suggest that the grounding of the substrate is needed if the substrate is conductive and is not needed if the substrate is a non-conductive high resistivity substrate." However, Hirabayashi does not ground the substrate instead the guard ring is grounded (For Example: See Column 4 Lines 62 and 63). Librizzi and Hirabayashi disclose the utilization of isolation in order to prevent cross talk or parasitic effects (For Example: See Column 1 Lines 20-57 (Librizzi) and Column 2 Lines 45-50 (Hirabayashi)).

Art Unit: 2822

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the semiconductor of Librizzi to include a guard ring that is in contact with the semiconductor substrate as disclosed in Hirabayashi because it aids in preventing cross-talk noise (For Example: See Column 2 Lines 45-50).

Finally, Applicant stated that “Claims 20-31 and 39 were mistakenly withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner.” The claims were not “mistakenly withdrawn” because the Applicant stated in the 10/24/05 election that “Applicant hereby elects Invention I, Embodiment I, directed to claims 1-19 without traverse.”

***Conclusion***

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2822

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monica Lewis whose telephone number is 571-272-1838. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zandra Smith can be reached on 571-272-2429. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300 for regular and after final communications.

ML

April 14, 2006



**Mary Wilczewski  
Primary Examiner**